

AD-A076 531

IOWA UNIV IOWA CITY DIV OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

F/6 12/1

LOCAL AND REGIONAL COHERENCE UTILITY ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES.(U)

JUL 79 M R NOVICK , D T CHUANG , D F DEKEYREL N00014-77-C-0428

UNCLASSIFIED TR-79-7

NL

/ OF /

AD  
A076531



END

DATE  
FILMED

12-79

DDC

AD A 076531

14 TR-  
TECHNICAL REPORT 79-7  
JULY, 1979

LEVEL 12

6  
LOCAL AND REGIONAL COHERENCE  
UTILITY ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

BY

10  
MELVIN R. NOVICK  
DAVID T. CHUANG  
DENNIS F. DEKEYREL

DDC  
RECEIVED  
NOV 9 1979  
E

11 Jul 79

12 34

9 Research Rept.  
Jan-Aug 79

REPORT PREPARED UNDER OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

CONTRACT N00014-77-C-0428

15  
MELVIN R. NOVICK, PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

IOWA CITY, IOWA

16 RR04204

17 RR0420401

DDC FILE COPY

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED  
REPRODUCTION IN WHOLE OR IN PART IS PERMITTED FOR  
ANY PURPOSE OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.

411417

79 11 08 062

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Technical Report 79-7	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) "Local and Regional Coherence Utility Assessment Procedures"		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Research Report January - August 1979
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER Technical Report 79-7
7. AUTHOR(s) Melvin R. Novick, David T. Chuang, and Dennis F. Dekeyrel		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) #00014-77-C-0428
		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 6115 3N; RR 042-04; RR042- 04-01; NR 150-404
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS University of Iowa Division of Educational Psychology Iowa City, Iowa 52242		12. REPORT DATE July, 1979
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Personnel and Training Research Programs Office of Naval Research (Code 458) Arlington, Virginia 22217		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 22
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)  Approved for public release, distribution unlimited		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)  Utility Assessment, Coherence, Anchoring, Certainty effect		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)  Certainty and anchoring effects have been shown to contaminate utility assessment procedures. This paper describes local, regional, and other procedures designed to avoid these effects.		

DD FORM 1473 1 JAN 75

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE  
S/N 0102-LF-014-6601

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

July 18, 1979

pag - 1-

LOCAL AND REGIONAL COHERENCE  
UTILITY ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

Melvin R. Novick

David T. Chuang

and

Dennis F. DeKeyrel

The University of Iowa

Novick and Lindley (1978, 1979) have dealt with the use of utility functions for applications in education and have advocated the use of the standard gamble (von Neumann and Morgenstern, 1953) elicitation procedure with the addition of coherence checking using overspecification and a least squares fit. In this procedure utilities are inferred from probability judgements offered by the assessor. This paper describes local and regional coherence procedures which seek utility coherence in successive restricted domains of the parameter space as preludes to overall coherence checking. These procedures and some others are viewed as possible ways of avoiding anchoring and certainty effect biases found in earlier fixed probability methods, and presumably present in current fixed state procedures.

Accession No.	MPIS GMAI
DEC TAB	Unannounced
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Availand/or	
Dist special	

*A*



### Introduction

Earlier approaches to utility assessment (Mosteller and Nogee, 1951; Schlaifer, 1959, 1971; Raiffa and Schlaifer, 1961; Keeney and Raiffa, 1976; and so on) have been based on the use of fixed probability (FP) assessment procedures in which utilities are elicited directly, through successive bisections of the parameter space. It has been suggested (Mosteller and Nogee, 1951) that such procedures are easier to use because subjects are more familiar with the quantity for which the utility function is desired than they are with probabilities, which they are required to state in the standard fixed state (SFS) procedure.

Although it was originally thought by psychologists that utility theory would prove useful as a descriptive model (Swalm, 1966, etc.), much criticism has recently been levied against its use in that capacity. As principal critics, Kahneman and Tversky (1978) have proposed an alternative descriptive model. The main basis for their criticism is that the phenomenon described by Tversky (1977) as the certainty effect results in preferences that violate the substitution axiom or expected utility hypothesis of utility theory. This axiom (hypothesis) states that preference order is invariant over probability mixtures and is formally equivalent to the assumption that there is no positive or negative utility for the act of gambling itself. Specifically, the certainty effect is the phenomenon that the utility of an outcome seems greater when it is certain than when it is uncertain. This effect can be observed when subjects are presented with a choice between a for-sure and a chance option, the choice appearing in the standard gamble, regional coherence, and local coherence assessment procedures to be described in this paper.

Utility theory as considered here is used as a normative model rather than as a descriptive model; however, it is still important to consider the certainty effect because Tversky (1977) has shown that even when subjects were told that their preferences violated utility theory, they were not inclined to change them (see also Kahneman and Tversky, 1972). This brings into question the reliability (coherence) and bias-free character of utility assessment procedures obtained through both fixed state and fixed probability methods and the value of those procedures in helping decision makers be more coherent. However, it should be pointed out that the gambles studied by Kahneman and Tversky and those studied by Novick and Lindley were somewhat different and that the latter authors also provided incoherence resolution procedures.

In another paper, Tversky and Kahneman (1974) described several heuristics used by persons in assessing probabilities and the biases to which they could lead. Of particular interest is the anchoring and adjustment heuristic, which Spetzler and Staël von Holstein (1975) have shown can reduce the reliability with which the bisection technique used by fixed probability models elicits utilities. This heuristic is the phenomenon whereby the most readily available piece of information often forms an initial basis for formulating responses from which subsequent responses are then adjusted. Since adjustments from this basis are often insufficient, a central bias results. According to Slovic (1972), the anchoring and adjustment heuristic is a natural strategy for easing the strain of integrating information. The anchor serves as a register in which one stores first

impressions or the results of earlier calculations. Why adjustments from the anchor are usually insufficient, though, is unclear. Slovic advances two hypotheses to explain the insufficient adjustment. First, people may stop adjusting too soon because they tire of the mental effort involved in adjusting. Alternatively, the anchor may take on a special salience, thus causing people to feel that there is less risk in making estimates close to it than in making estimates that deviate far from it. According to Spetzler and Staël von Holstein (1975), experimentation has shown that subjects tend to produce a central bias when, in the fixed probability bisection method, they are asked first for the median for an uncertain quantity and then for the quartiles.

Later, in reviewing the role of man-machine systems in decision analysis, Slovic, Fischhoff, and Lichtenstein (1977) suggested that human factors such as the ways in which variations in instructions or informational displays affect people's performance are important and should be studied in more detail. Questions of complexity and representativeness of material seem to have substantial effect on assessors responses (Fischhoff, Slovic, and Lichtenstein, 1977; Vlek, 1973). The study of such factors might lead to an assessment procedure that minimizes the judgmental basis and heuristics described earlier. This position was strengthened by the discussion of Fischhoff, Slovic, and Lichtenstein (1979). A consideration of these ideas promoted the development of a new format introduced later in this paper.

Extensive previous work in this area has raised more questions concerning bias and coherence than it has provided answers. An apparently pessimistic mood prevails, not inappropriately, given the importance of the questions that have been raised (Hogarth, 1975; Slovic, 1975; and Fischhoff, Slovic and Lichtenstefn, 1979). Nevertheless, the very extensiveness of this research must itself imply a high assessment for the product of the probability of resolving these difficulties and the value of this outcome. The position taken here is that bias and incoherence can be reduced if (1) elicitations are carefully fashioned in a Computer-Assisted Data Analysis (CADA) environment (Mick, Woodworth, Hamer, Chen, Chuang, Libby, Molenaar, Lewis & Isaacs, 1980), (2) assessors are aided in resolving incoherence, and (3) if the assessments concern states and actions that are meaningful and important to the assessor at the time the assessment is made.

Consider a variable  $\theta$  and the utility function  $U(\theta)$  for which assessment is required. In most applications  $\theta$  will be a real variable, such as grade point average (GPA), but this is not necessary. Although the contrary assumption is sometimes made, it seems sensible to us to demand that a utility function be bounded.

There are two standard approaches to assessing a utility function: fixed probability and fixed state. In the former, the subject is presented with a gamble on two values, or states,  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  with a fixed probability- $p$ , say, for  $\theta_1$  and  $1 - p$  for  $\theta_2$  - and is required to choose an intermediate state  $\theta_3$  such that he/she is indifferent with respect to the gamble and  $\theta_3$  for sure. In applications, typically  $p = 1/2$  because this gamble is easiest for assessors (subjects) to understand.



In the fixed-state method, the states  $\theta_1$ ,  $\theta_2$ , and  $\theta_3$  are fixed,  $\theta_3$  still being intermediate between  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$ . The subject is required to state a probability,  $p$ , such that he/she is indifferent between  $\theta_3$  for sure and the following gamble:  $\theta_1$  with probability  $p$  and  $\theta_2$  with probability  $1-p$ . If  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  have utilities of 1 and 0, respectively, the gamble has expected utility  $p$ , the indifference probability assigned to  $\theta_3$ .

In the fixed-state method, let us suppose that a number of states,  $\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{N+1}$ , are selected. We shall further suppose that these states are ordered in the sense that  $\theta_j$  is preferred to  $\theta_i$  whenever  $j > i$ ; in particular,  $\theta_{N+1}$  is the best and  $\theta_0$  the worst state. Then the utility function  $U(\theta)$  will be strictly increasing.

Without loss of generality, the utility for  $\theta_{N+1}$  can be assigned the value 1 and that for  $\theta_0$  can be assigned the value 0, thus placing bounds on the utility values to be assigned to the various states. We must then find  $N$  such values:  $U(\theta_1), U(\theta_2), \dots, U(\theta_N)$ . We first consider adjacent gambles, that is, a situation in which the subject is asked to compare the sure outcome  $\theta_n$  ( $1 \leq n \leq N$ ) against a gamble with possible outcomes  $\theta_{n-1}$  and  $\theta_{n+1}$ , representing, because of the ordering of the states, situations respectively worse and better than  $\theta_n$ . Specifically, after a brief review of the meaning of probability, the subject is asked to state the probability  $p_n$  for  $\theta_{n+1}$ , and consequently  $1 - p_n$  for  $\theta_{n-1}$ , that makes him/her indifferent with respect to the gamble and  $\theta_n$  for sure. Writing  $U(\theta_n) = u_n$  (so that  $u_0 = 0, u_{N+1} = 1$ ) and equating the expected utilities for the two situations gives us

$$u_n = p_n u_{n+1} + (1 - p_n) u_{n-1}.$$



If this is done for all  $n$ ,  $1 \leq n \leq N$ , we have  $N$  equations in  $N$  unknowns and aside from exceptional cases, the utilities are uniquely determined. The solution is

$$u_{n+1} = G_n / G_N$$

for  $0 \leq n \leq N$ , where

$$G_n = \sum_{i=0}^n F_i, F_n = \prod_{i=0}^n f_i, \text{ and } f_i = (1 - p_i)/p_i.$$

Suppose a subject has responded to the  $N$  question previously considered and, from the answers given, his/her utilities  $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_N$  have been determined. Suppose also that he/she is asked to consider a gamble that will yield either  $\theta_{n+2}$  or  $\theta_{n-2}$ , against  $\theta_n$  for sure. Then the probability  $q_n$ , associated with  $\theta_{n+2}$ , satisfies

$$u_n = q_n u_{n+2} + (1 - q_n) u_{n-2}.$$

For the fixed state standard gambles procedure the suggestion offered by Novick and Lindley is that to exploit coherence fully, we must ask for more probability assessments than are needed to calculate the utilities and then compare them for coherence. The idea of requiring the experimenter to give more than the minimum number of judgments in fitting a personal probability distribution has been used by Pratt, Raiffa, and Schlaifer (1965) and has been exploited systematically both for the assessment of probabilities and utilities in the development of the Computer Assisted Data Analysis Monitor (CADA) (Novick, 1973, 1975). In the context of utility assessments, the idea has been used by Becker, DeGroot, and Marschak (1963) with fixed probability assessments, and we shall discuss this presently.

Experience shows us that assessors are almost always incoherent but readily attempt to resolve their incoherences when these are brought to their attention (cf. MacCrimmon, 1965). It may, however, be true that one kind of gamble (e.g., adjacent gambles) may introduce one kind of systematic bias and another kind (e.g., extreme gambles) may introduce a second kind of bias. Therefore, rather than just asking the subject to revise some of his/her assessments, Novick and Lindley (1979) suggest assisting the subject by providing a least squares fit in the log-odds metric for the  $N$  undetermined utility values. A computer program has been written to carry out the interrogation of the assessor and to perform the least squares fit and is available on the CADA Monitor (Novick 1973, 1975; Novick, Isaacs, and Dekeyrel, 1977; Isaacs and Novick, 1978).

In any comparison of fixed state with fixed probability assessments, the role of coherence seems to us to play a dominant role. Although subjects often prefer fixed probability assessments, especially when the probability is  $1/2$ , exploiting coherence in this context is harder than with the fixed state procedure. For example, suppose, as usual, that a subject is asked for the certainty equivalent of a gamble, at even odds, on the best ( $\theta_{N+1}$ ) and worst ( $\theta_0$ ) states. Let his/her stated value be  $\theta_m$ , say, having  $u(\theta_m) = 1/2$ . The subject is then asked for the certainty equivalents for even-odds gambles on  $(\theta_0, \theta_m)$  and  $(\theta_m, \theta_{N+1})$ . If these values are denoted by  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$ , respectively, then the utilities of  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  are  $u(\theta_1) = 1/4$  and  $u(\theta_2) = 3/4$ . Finally, he/she is asked to consider an even-odds gamble on  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$ . But it is rather transparent that for coherence the result must be  $\theta_m$ , so that the four judgments can scarcely be considered independent. In this field (as in other

measurement fields) obtaining independent repetitions of the same assessment is hardly ever possible, thus the emphasis ought to be on independent assessments of related quantities. This, we feel, is more nearly achieved with the fixed-state assessments. The above discussion is taken with some condensation from Novick and Lindley (1979).

The question that must now be addressed is whether the incoherence resolution of the least squares method described in SFS above avoids the certainty and anchoring effects or whether better methods can be found. The remainder of this paper will be devoted to describing a refinement in the least squares SFS procedure and in describing three new procedures that more directly address these biasing effects.

A word concerning ease of response may be in order. Mosteller was certainly correct in saying that FP is easier than FS, and, indeed, without interactive conversational computing facilities an FS assessment procedure may well be unbearably difficult. With conversational computing, however, an FS procedure is bearable and there is no reason to believe the the easier method is more bias free. Indeed, the contrary could be true.

In the current version of the SFS procedure on CADA, subjects are given situations consisting of a for-sure and a chance option on grade point averages in the range 0-4 and are asked for the probabilities that make them indifferent with respect to the two options in each situation (i.e., their indifference probabilities). The indifference probabilities for the fixed state gambles are elicited using one of two formats for presenting the gambles. Format two requests a direct magnitude estimation as illustrated earlier. Format one asks for preferences for gambles or sure things for p values .1, .9, .2, .8, etc. or .9, .1, .8, .2 etc. with zeroing in on the indifference point.

FORMAT ONE

3.0	p chance	indifferent=0
2.5	for sure	for sure =1
2.0	1-p chance	chance =2
		restart =3

Which would you prefer if p were.XX ? \_\_\_\_\_. (This question was repeated using the following p values-- .1, .9, .2, .8, ...--until p was found to be between .5 and .6, say. Then the questioning procedure used p values of .52, .58, .54, ... until the subject's indifference p had been determined.)

FORMAT TWO

for	gamble		p that makes
sure	with prob p	with prob 1-p	you indifferent
2.5	3.0	2.0	? ____.

Table 1. Formats for the SFS utility assessment procedure



Format two, the direct probability assessment format is the one used by Novick and Lindley, (1979). Format one, the ends-in procedure, has been advanced as a method for avoiding anchoring. Since indifference points are typically between .2 and .8 any initial anchor (.1 or .9) is erased before any careful judgment must be made. Also, the starting values alternate between .1 and .9 thus avoiding any constant ordering effect. It is our as-yet-unsubstantiated belief that this format is both easier and less subject to anchoring than format two. This format is now used with several assessment procedures.

In order to avoid the documented biases of the certainty effect in utility assessment, a new procedure has been considered: the paired binary gambles (PBG) procedure. This procedure is illustrated in Table 2 below. The paired gambles in the table can be abbreviated as (1.5 3.0, 2.0 2.5).

Paired Binary Gambles	
<u>SITUATION 1</u>	<u>SITUATION 2</u>
3.0 p	2.5 p
1.5 1-p	2.0 1-p

Table 2. PBG procedure

The ends-in format is used to elicit the probability that will make the subject indifferent with respect to the two situations (gambles). A least squares fit of the indifference probabilities can then be made and subjects can proceed as in the SFS procedure. Although the PBG procedure is considered here as a fixed state procedure,



it has previously been used in a fixed probability paradigm (Kneppreth, Gustafson, Leifer, & Johnson, 1974). Suppes and Walsh (1959) have considered such gambles strictly in the sense of determining preferences between the two situations, without eliciting either indifference probabilities or equivalence points.

The obvious hope is that the PBG procedure will avoid the certainty effect because the comparison is between two sets of gambles, and thus does not involve the for-sure option. We have used PBG in some informal assessments but have not yet been convinced of its usefulness. First, it is difficult even for experienced subjects. Fatigue and boredom are definite problems. We are not sure that there is not a bias in that one situation always compares two adjacent states while the other always describes two states twice removed. We have not discarded this procedure, but we feel that refinements may be necessary if it is to be useful.

Next we define the Regional Coherence (RC procedure). In the RC procedure, indifference probabilities are elicited separately for two SFS gambles using the ends-in format. Subjects are then presented with a table showing the initial gambles (situations 1 and 2 with their indifference probabilities) and two additional gambles (situations 3 and 4). They are told that their initial responses imply certain specific indifference probabilities for the two new gambles.

Table 3 illustrates the latter part of this procedure.

	Situations			
	-- 1 -----	2 -----	3 -----	4 ----
p chance	1.50	2.00	2.00	2.00
for sure	1.00	1.50	1.00	1.50
1-p chance	0.50	1.00	0.50	0.50
	p=.53	p=.58	p=.40	p=.75

Table 3. RC Procedure

Assessors are then given the opportunity to change the indifference probabilities, two at a time, until they are indifferent in all four situations. They choose the two situations for which they wish to change the indifference probabilities and the magnitude estimation format is then implemented to generate the revised probabilities.

The final procedure is called the local coherence (LC) procedure. This procedure presents subjects with two types of hypothetical choice situations: (1) a for-sure and a chance option (the standard gamble) and (2) two chance options. The ends-in format is used to elicit an indifference probability for the first situation, after which the subject is told that that response implies that he/she should be indifferent with respect to the two options in situation 2. Note that the subject only specifies the indifference probability for the standard gamble. Table 4 below illustrates this procedure. The probabilities for the second situation are uniquely determined by that specification.

SITUATION 1		SITUATION 2		
		option one		option two
4.00	.75 chance	.19	4.00	---
3.00	for sure	---	3.00	.25
1.00	.25 chance	.81	1.00	.75

Table 4. LC Procedure

If the subject is not indifferent in both situations, he/she modifies the situation 1 indifference probability and then is again presented with a table similar to Table 4 above. This continues until the subject is indifferent with respect to the two situations.

In choosing a fixed state assessment procedure we are free to select

- (1) A response format
  - a. ends-in
  - b. direct specification
- (2) A comparison format
  - a. standard fixed state
  - b. paired binary gambles
  - c. regional coherence
  - d. local coherence
- (3) Overall coherence checking by least squares
  - a. yes
  - b. no

The temptation for a person trained in both psychology and statistics to undertake the experimental comparison using some subset of a 2 by 4

by 2 factorial design is overpowering. Indeed the tooling-up for this experiment has begun including a further comparison with the fixed probability method and an investigation of comparative bias for central and extreme values of  $\theta$ . For a Bayesian statistician, yielding to this temptation leads to a compulsion to state a prior distribution. In the absence of a precisely stated model this is not possible, but it is possible to state some general beliefs. I shall now do this and also invite you to attend the Psychometric Society meetings in May of 1980 where I shall report on the results of these experiments.

First, I believe that SFS with overall LSQ coherence checking will prove to be good but not best. Subjects find it hard to make unaided adjustments. As a result, incoherence will remain high, but overall fits will be tolerably good ( $p=.7$ ). However, we are working on improvements that could make this procedure more attractive. I believe that the ends-in format will be preferred over direct magnitude estimation and will reduce the anchoring effect ( $p=.8$ ). This may not hold for very experienced assessors who may find it tedious.

I believe that PBG will be unpopular and ineffective unless we find some simplification ( $p=.9$ ). At present it is difficult and fatiguing and responses tend to be less than carefully considered.

I believe that regional and local coherence will both be useful and both will largely eliminate anchoring and adjustment biases ( $p=.8$ ). I believe the regional coherence will be preferred by inexperienced users ( $p=.6$ ) and local coherence by experienced users ( $p=.7$ , but perhaps only professional statisticians). Local Coherence provides a display of the large effect on extreme comparisons of minor adjustments in non-



extreme comparisons. It is a powerful tool for locating the most desirable point in the probability range  $p \pm .025$ . It is unclear to me whether overall least squares overfitting will be useful in conjunction with the RC or LC procedures, but my prior probability is .6 that it is.

Finally, for certain points I have high personal probability. Utility elicitation procedures can currently be conducted with accuracy and ease on CADA. Indeed, they can be conducted with sufficient ease and potentially with sufficient freedom from bias as to make applications of utility theory to education entirely feasible when the assessor is confronted with a specific problem of interest and importance, and when that problem is presented clearly and unambiguously.



## References

- DeGroot, M. H. Optimal statistical decisions. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- DeGroot, M. H. Probability and statistics. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1975.
- Fischhoff, B., Slovic, P., & Lichtenstein, S. Fault trees: Sensitivity of estimated failure probabilities to problem representation. Technical report PTR--1042-77-8, 1977.
- Fischhoff, B., Slovic, P., & Lichtenstein, S. Knowing what you want: Measuring labile values. Appearing in T. Wallston (Ed.), Cognitive Processes in Choice and Decision Behavior. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, In press.
- Gross, A. L., & Su, W. H. Defining a "fair" or "unbiased" selection model: A question of utilities. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 345-351.
- Hogarth, R. M. Cognitive processes and the assessment of subjective probability distributions. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 1975, 20, 350, 271-289.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. Econometrica, 1978.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. Subjective probability: A judgment of representativeness. Cognitive Psychology, 1972, 3, 430-454.

- Keeney, R. L., & Raiffa, H. Decisions with multiple objectives: Preferences and value tradeoffs. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1976.
- Kneppreth, N. P., Gustafson, D. H., Leifer, R. P., & Johnson, E. M. Techniques for the assessment of worth. U.S. Army research institute for the behavioral and social sciences. Technical paper #254, August 1974, 40-53.
- Lehmann, E. L. Testing Statistical Hypothesis. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959.
- Mosteller, F., & Nogee, P. An experimental measurement of utility. Journal of Political Economy, 1951, 59, 5, 371-404.
- Novick, M. R. Computer-assisted data analysis monitor, 1973.
- Novick, M. R. Computer-assisted data analysis monitor, 1975.
- Novick, M. R., & Isaacs, G. L. Manual for the computer-assisted data analysis (CADA) Monitor-1978.
- Novick, M. R., Isaacs, G. L., Hamer, R., Chen, J., Chuang, D., Woodworth, G., Molenaar, I., Lewis, C., & Libby, D. Computer-assisted data analysis monitor, 1980.
- Novick, M. R., & Jackson, P. H. Statistical methods for educational and psychological research. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.
- Novick, M. R., & Lindley, D. V. Fixed state assessment of utility functions, In press, 1979.

- Novick, M. R., & Lindley, D. V. The use of more realistic utility functions in educational applications. Journal of Educational Measurement, 1978, 3, 181-192.
- Novick, M. R., & Petersen, N. S. Towards equalizing educational and employment opportunity. Journal of Educational Measurement, 1976, 13, 77-88.
- Petersen, N. S. An expected utility model for "optimal" selection. Journal of Educational Statistics, 1976, 4, 333-358.
- Petersen, N. S., & Novick, M. R. An evaluation of some models for culture-fair selection. Journal of Educational Measurement, 1976, 13, 3-31.
- Raiffa, H., & Schlaifer, K. Applied statistical decision theory. Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1961.
- Schlaifer, R. Probability and statistics for business decisions: An introduction to managerial economics under uncertainty. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1959.
- Slovic, P. Choice between equally valued alternatives, Journal of Experimental Psychology, Human Perception and Performance. 1975, 3, 280-287.
- Slovic, P. From Shakespeare to Simon: Speculation--and some evidence--about man's ability to process information. Oregon Research Institute Research Bulletin. 1972, 12, 2.
- Slovic, P., Fischhoff, B., & Lichtenstein, S. Behavioral decision theory. Annual Review of Psychology, 1977, 28, 1-39.
- Slovic, P., Fischhoff, B., & Lichtenstein, S. Eliciting labile values: At times, people do not know what they want, creating serious problems for value elicitation procedures.

- Spetzler, C. S., & Stael von Holstein, C. A. S. Probability encoding decision analysis. Management Science, 1975, 22, 340-358.
- Suppes, P., & Walsh, K. A non-linear model for the experimental measurement of utility. Behavioral Science, 1959, 4, 204-211.
- Swalm, R. O. Utility theory--insights into risk taking. Harvard Business Review, 1966, 44, 6, 123, 136.
- Tversky, A. On the elicitation of preferences: Descriptive and prescriptive considerations. In D. E. Bell, R. L. Keeney, & H. Raiffa (Eds.), Conflicting objectives in decisions. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 1977, 209-222.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. Science, 1974, 185, 1124-1131.
- Van der Linden, W. J., & Mellenbergh, G. J. Optimal cutting scores using a linear loss function. Applied Psychological Measurement, 1977, 1, 593-599.
- Vlek, C. A. J. Coherence of human judgment in a limited probabilistic environment. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1973, 9, 460-481.
- Von Neumann, J., & Morgenstern, O. Theory of games and economic behavior. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953.



## Navy

- 1 Dr. Ed Aiken  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152
- 1 Dr. Jack R. Borsting  
Provost & Academic Dean  
U.S. Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93940
- 1 Dr. Robert Breaux  
Code N-71  
NAVTRAEQUIPCEN  
Orlando, FL 32813
- 1 MR. MAURICE CALLAHAN  
Pers 23a  
Bureau of Naval Personnel  
Washington, DC 20370
- 1 Dr. Richard Elster  
Department of Administrative Sciences  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93940
- 1 DR. PAT FEDERICO  
NAVY PERSONNEL R&D CENTER  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92152
- 1 Dr. Paul Foley  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152
- 1 Dr. John Ford  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152
- 1 CAPT. D.H. GRAGG, MC, USN  
HEAD, SECTION ON MEDICAL EDUCATION  
UNIFORMED SERVICES UNIV. OF THE  
HEALTH SCIENCES  
6917 ARLINGTON ROAD  
BETHESDA, MD 20014
- 1 Dr. Norman J. Kerr  
Chief of Naval Technical Training  
Naval Air Station Memphis (75)  
Millington, TN 38054

## Navy

- 1 Dr. Leonard Kroeker  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152
- 1 CHAIRMAN, LEADERSHIP & LAW DEPT.  
DIV. OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY  
ANNAPOLIS, MD 21402
- 1 Dr. William L. Maloy  
Principal Civilian Advisor for  
Education and Training  
Naval Training Command, Code 00A  
Pensacola, FL 32508
- 1 CAPT Richard L. Martin  
USS Francis Marion (LPA-249)  
FPO New York, NY 09501
- 1 Dr. James McBride  
Code 301  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152
- 1 DR. WILLIAM MONTAGUE  
LRDC  
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH  
3939 O'HARA STREET  
PITTSBURGH, PA 15213
- 1 Library  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152
- 6 Commanding Officer  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Code 2627  
Washington, DC 20390
- 1 OFFICE OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL  
(CODE 26)  
DEPT. OF THE NAVY  
WASHINGTON, DC 20390
- 1 JOHN OLSEN  
CHIEF OF NAVAL EDUCATION &  
TRAINING SUPPORT  
PENSACOLA, FL 32509



## Navy

- 1 Psychologist  
ONR Branch Office  
495 Summer Street  
Boston, MA 02210
- 1 Psychologist  
ONR Branch Office  
536 S. Clark Street  
Chicago, IL 60605
- 1 Office of Naval Research  
Code 200  
Arlington, VA 22217
- 1 Code 436  
Office of Naval Research  
Arlington, VA 22217
- 1 Office of Naval Research  
Code 437  
800 N. Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217
- 5 Personnel & Training Research Programs  
(Code 453)  
Office of Naval Research  
Arlington, VA 22217
- 1 Psychologist  
OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH BRANCH  
223 OLD MARYLEBONE ROAD  
LONDON, NW, 15TH ENGLAND
- 1 Psychologist  
ONR Branch Office  
1030 East Green Street  
Pasadena, CA 91101
- 1 Scientific Director  
Office of Naval Research  
Scientific Liaison Group/Tokyo  
American Embassy  
APO San Francisco, CA 96503
- 1 Office of the Chief of Naval Operations  
Research, Development, and Studies Branch  
(OP-102)  
Washington, DC 20350

## Navy

- 1 Scientific Advisor to the Chief of  
Naval Personnel (Pers-Or)  
Naval Bureau of Personnel  
Room 4410, Arlington Annex  
Washington, DC 20370
- 1 LT Frank C. Petho, MSC, USNR (Ph.D)  
Code L51  
Naval Aerospace Medical Research Laboratory  
Pensacola, FL 32508
- 1 DR. RICHARD A. POLLAK  
ACADEMIC COMPUTING CENTER  
U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY  
ANNAPOLIS, MD 21402
- 1 Mr. Arnold Rubenstein  
Naval Personnel Support Technology  
Naval Material Command (08T244)  
Room 1044, Crystal Plaza #5  
2221 Jefferson Davis Highway  
Arlington, VA 20360
- 1 A. A. SJOHOLM  
TECH. SUPPORT, CODE 201  
NAVY PERSONNEL R & D CENTER  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92152
- 1 Mr. Robert Smith  
Office of Chief of Naval Operations  
OP-987E  
Washington, DC 20350
- 1 Dr. Alfred F. Snode  
Training Analysis & Evaluation Group  
(TAEG)  
Dept. of the Navy  
Orlando, FL 32813
- 1 Dr. Richard Sorensen  
Navy Personnel R&D Center  
San Diego, CA 92152
- 1 CDR Charles J. Theisen, JR. MSC, USN  
Head Human Factors Engineering Div.  
Naval Air Development Center  
Warminster, PA 18974

## Navy

- 1 W. Gary Thomson  
Naval Ocean Systems Center  
Code 7132  
San Diego, CA 92152
- 1 Dr. Ronald Weitzman  
Department of Administrative Sciences  
U. S. Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93940
- 1 DR. MARTIN F. WISKOFF  
NAVY PERSONNEL R & D CENTER  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92152

## Army

- 1 Technical Director  
U. S. Army Research Institute for the  
Behavioral and Social Sciences  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 HQ USAREUE & 7th Army  
CDCSOPS  
USAREUE Director of GED  
APO New York 09403
- 1 DR. RALPH DUSEK  
U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE  
5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Myron Fischl  
U.S. Army Research Institute for the  
Social and Behavioral Sciences  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Beatrice J. Farr  
Army Research Institute (PERI-OK)  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Milt Maier  
U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE  
5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Harold F. O'Neil, Jr.  
ATTN: PERI-OK  
5001 EISENHOWER AVENUE  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Robert Ross  
U.S. Army Research Institute for the  
Social and Behavioral Sciences  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Robert Sasmor  
U. S. Army Research Institute for the  
Behavioral and Social Sciences  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

## Army

- 1 Director, Training Development  
U.S. Army Administration Center  
ATTN: Dr. Sherrill  
Ft. Benjamin Harrison, IN 46218
- 1 Dr. Frederick Steinheiser  
U. S. Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333
- 1 Dr. Joseph Ward  
U.S. Army Research Institute  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue  
Alexandria, VA 22333

## Air Force

- 1 Air Force Human Resources Lab  
AFHRL/PED  
Brooks AFB, TX 78235
- 1 Air University Library  
AUL/LSE 76/443  
Maxwell AFB, AL 36112
- 1 Dr. Philip De Leo  
AFHRL/TT  
Lowry AFB, CO 80230
- 1 DR. G. A. ECKSTRAND  
AFHRL/AS  
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB, OH 45433
- 1 Dr. Genevieve Haddad  
Program Manager  
Life Sciences Directorate  
AFOSR  
Bolling AFB, DC 20332
- 1 CDR. MERCER  
CNET LIAISON OFFICER  
AFHRL/FLYING TRAINING DIV.  
WILLIAMS AFB, AZ 85224
- 1 Dr. Ross L. Morgan (AFHRL/ASR)  
Wright -Patterson AFB  
Ohio 45433
- 1 Dr. Roger Pennell  
AFHRL/TT  
Lowry AFB, CO 80230
- 1 Personnel Analysis Division  
HQ USAF/DPXXA  
Washington, DC 20330
- 1 Research Branch  
AFMPC/DPMYP  
Randolph AFB, TX 78148
- 1 Dr. Malcolm Ree  
AFHRL/PED  
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Air Force

- 1 Dr. Marty Rockway (AFHRL/TT)  
Lowry AFB  
Colorado 80230
- 1 Jack A. Thorpe, Capt, USAF  
Program Manager  
Life Sciences Directorate  
AFOSR  
Bolling AFB, DC 20332
- 1 Brian K. Waters, LCOL, USAF  
Air University  
Maxwell AFB  
Montgomery, AL 36112

Marines

- 1 H. William Greenup  
Education Advisor (E031)  
Education Center, MCDEC  
Quantico, VA 22134
- 1 Director, Office of Manpower Utilization  
HQ, Marine Corps (MPU)  
BCB, Bldg. 2009  
Quantico, VA 22134
- 1 DR. A.L. SLAFKOSKY  
SCIENTIFIC ADVISOR (CODE RD-1)  
HQ, U.S. MARINE CORPS  
WASHINGTON, DC 20380



CoastGuard

1 Mr. Richard Lanterman  
PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH (G-P-1/62)  
U.S. COAST GUARD HQ  
WASHINGTON, DC 20590

1 Dr. Thomas Warm  
U. S. Coast Guard Institute  
P. O. Substation 18  
Oklahoma City, OK 73169

Other DoD

12 Defense Documentation Center  
Cameron Station, Bldg. 5  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Attn: TC

1 Dr. Dexter Fletcher  
ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY  
1400 WILSON BLVD.  
ARLINGTON, VA 22209

1 Dr. William Graham  
Testing Directorate  
HEPCOM  
Ft. Sheridan, IL 60037

1 Military Assistant for Training and  
Personnel Technology  
Office of the Under Secretary of Defense  
for Research & Engineering  
Room 3D129, The Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20301

1 MAJOR Wayne Sellman, USAF  
Office of the Assistant Secretary  
of Defense (MRA&L)  
3B930 The Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20301

Civil Govt

- 1 Dr. Susan Chipman  
Basic Skills Program  
National Institute of Education  
1200 19th Street NW  
Washington, DC 20208
- 1 Dr. William Gorham, Director  
Personnel R&D Center  
Office of Personnel Managment  
1900 E Street NW  
Washington, DC 20415
- 1 Dr. Joseph I. Lipson  
Division of Science Education  
Room W-633  
National Science Foundation  
Washington, DC 20550
- 1 Dr. John Mays  
National Institute of Education  
1200 19th Street NW  
Washington, DC 20208
- 1 Dr. Arthur Melmed  
National Intitute of Education  
1200 19th Street NW  
Washington, DC 20208
- 1 Dr. Andrew R. Molnar  
Science Education Dev.  
and Research  
National Science Foundation  
Washington, DC 20550
- 1 Dr. Lalitha P. Sanathanan  
Environmental Impact Studies Division  
Argonne National Laboratory  
9700 S. Cass Avenue  
Argonne, IL 60439
- 1 Dr. Jeffrey Schiller  
National Institute of Education  
1200 19th St. NW  
Washington, DC 20208

Civil Govt

- 1 Dr. Thomas G. Sticht  
Easic Skills Program  
National Institute of Education  
1200 19th Street NW  
Washington, DC 20208
- 1 Dr. Vern W. Urry  
Personnel R&D Center  
Office of Personnel Managment  
1900 E Street NW  
Washington, DC 20415
- 1 Dr. Frank Withrow  
U. S. Office of Education  
400 6th Street SW  
Washington, DC 20202
- 1 Dr. Joseph L. Young, Director  
Memory & Cognitive Processes  
National Science Foundation  
Washington, DC 20550

## Non Govt

- 1 Dr. Earl A. Alluisi  
HQ, AFHRL (AFSC)  
Brooks AFB, TX 78235
- 1 Dr. Erling B. Anderson  
University of Copenhagen  
Studiestraedt  
Copenhagen  
DENMARK
- 1 1 psychological research unit  
Dept. of Defense (Army Office)  
Campbell Park Offices  
Canberra ACT 2600, Australia
- 1 Dr. Alan Baddeley  
Medical Research Council  
Applied Psychology Unit  
15 Chaucer Road  
Cambridge CB2 2EF  
ENGLAND
- 1 Dr. Isaac Bejar  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08450
- 1 Dr. Warner Birice  
Streitkraefteamt  
Rosenberg 5300  
Bonn, West Germany D-5300
- 1 Dr. R. Darrel Bock  
Department of Education  
University of Chicago  
Chicago, IL 60637
- 1 Dr. Nicholas A. Bond  
Dept. of Psychology  
Sacramento State College  
500 Jay Street  
Sacramento, CA 95819
- 1 Dr. David G. Bowers  
Institute for Social Research  
University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

## Non Govt

- 1 Dr. Robert Brennan  
American College Testing Programs  
P. O. Box 168  
Iowa City, IA 52240
- 1 DR. C. VICTOR BUNDERSON  
WICAT INC.  
UNIVERSITY PLAZA, SUITE 10  
1160 SO. STATE ST.  
OREM, UT 84057
- 1 Dr. John E. Carroll  
Psychometric Lab  
Univ. of No. Carolina  
Davie Hall 013A  
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
- 1 Charles Myers Library  
Livingstone House  
Livingstone Road  
Stratford  
London E15 2LJ  
ENGLAND
- 1 Dr. John Chiorini  
Litton-Mellonics  
Box 1286  
Springfield, VA 22151
- 1 Dr. Kenneth E. Clark  
College of Arts & Sciences  
University of Rochester  
River Campus Station  
Rochester, NY 14627
- 1 Dr. Norman Cliff  
Dept. of Psychology  
Univ. of So. California  
University Park  
Los Angeles, CA 90007
- 1 Dr. William Coffman  
Iowa Testing Programs  
University of Iowa  
Iowa City, IA 52242

## Non Govt

- 1 Dr. Meredith Crawford  
Department of Engineering Administration  
George Washington University  
Suite 305  
2101 L Street N. W.  
Washington, DC 20037
- 1 Dr. Hans Cronbag  
Education Research Center  
University of Leyden  
Boerhaavelaan 2  
Leyden  
The NETHERLANDS
- 1 Dr. Emmanuel Donchin  
Department of Psychology  
University of Illinois  
Champaign, IL 61820
- 1 MAJOR I. N. EVONIC  
CANADIAN FORCES PERS. APPLIED RESEARCH  
1107 AVENUE ROAD  
TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA
- 1 Dr. Leonard Feldt  
Lindquist Center for Measurement  
University of Iowa  
Iowa City, IA 52242
- 1 Dr. Richard L. Ferguson  
The American College Testing Program  
P.O. Box 168  
Iowa City, IA 52240
- 1 Dr. Victor Fields  
Dept. of Psychology  
Montgomery College  
Rockville, MD 20850
- 1 Dr. Gerhardt Fischer  
Liebigasse 5  
Vienna 1010  
Austria
- 1 Dr. Donald Fitzgerald  
University of New England  
Armidale, New South Wales 2351  
AUSTRALIA

## Non Govt

- 1 Dr. Edwin A. Fleishman  
Advanced Research Resources Organ.  
Suite 900  
4330 East West Highway  
Washington, DC 20014
- 1 Dr. John R. Frederiksen  
Bolt Beranek & Newman  
50 Moulton Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138
- 1 DR. ROBERT GLASER  
LRDC  
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH  
3939 O'HARA STREET  
PITTSBURGH, PA 15213
- 1 Dr. Ross Greene  
CTB/McGraw Hill  
Del Monte Research Park  
Monterey, CA 93940
- 1 Dr. Alan Gross  
Center for Advanced Study in Education  
City University of New York  
New York, NY 10036
- 1 Dr. Ron Hambleton  
School of Education  
University of Massachusetts  
Amherst, MA 01002
- 1 Dr. Chester Harris  
School of Education  
University of California  
Santa Barbara, CA 93106
- 1 Dr. Lloyd Humphreys  
Department of Psychology  
University of Illinois  
Champaign, IL 61820
- 1 Library  
HumRRO/Western Division  
27857 Berwick Drive  
Carmel, CA 93921



Non Govt

Non Govt

- 1 Dr. Steven Hunka  
Department of Education  
University of Alberta  
Edmonton, Alberta  
CANADA
- 1 Dr. Earl Hunt  
Dept. of Psychology  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA 98105
- 1 Dr. Huynh Huynh  
Department of Education  
University of South Carolina  
Columbia, SC 29208
- 1 Dr. Carl J. Jensema  
Gallaudet College  
Kendall Green  
Washington, DC 20002
- 1 Dr. Arnold F. Kanarick  
Honeywell, Inc.  
2600 Ridgeway Pkwy  
Minneapolis, MN 55413
- 1 Dr. John A. Keats  
University of Newcastle  
Newcastle, New South Wales  
AUSTRALIA
- 1 Mr. Marlin Kroger  
1117 Via Goleta  
Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274
- 1 LCOL. C.R.J. LAFLEUR  
PERSONNEL APPLIED RESEARCH  
NATIONAL DEFENSE HQS  
101 COLONEL BY DRIVE  
OTTAWA, CANADA K1A 0K2
- 1 Dr. Michael Levine  
Department of Educational Psychology  
University of Illinois  
Champaign, IL 61820

- 1 Faculteit Sociale Wetenschappen  
Rijksuniversiteit Groningen  
Oude Boteringestraat  
Groningen  
NETHERLANDS
- 1 Dr. Robert Linn  
College of Education  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, IL 61801
- 1 Dr. Frederick M. Lord  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08540
- 1 Dr. Gary Marco  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08450
- 1 Dr. Scott Maxwell  
Department of Psychology  
University of Houston  
Houston, TX 77025
- 1 Dr. Sam Mayo  
Loyola University of Chicago  
Chicago, IL 60601
- 1 Dr. James A. Paulson  
Portland State University  
P.O. Box 751  
Portland, OR 97207
- 1 MR. LUIGI PETRULLO  
2431 N. EDGEWOOD STREET  
ARLINGTON, VA 22207
- 1 DR. STEVEN M. PINE  
4950 Douglas Avenue  
Golden Valley, MN 55416
- 1 DR. DIANE M. RAMSEY-KLEE  
R-K RESEARCH & SYSTEM DESIGN  
3947 RIDGEMONT DRIVE  
MALIBU, CA 90265

## Non Govt

## Non Govt

- 1 MIN. RET. M. RAUCH  
P 11 4  
BUNDESMINISTERIUM DER VERTEIDIGUNG  
POSTFACH 161  
53 BONN 1, GERMANY
- 1 Dr. Peter B. Read  
Social Science Research Council  
605 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10016
- 1 Dr. Mark D. Reckase  
Educational Psychology Dept.  
University of Missouri-Columbia  
12 Hill Hall  
Columbia, MO 65201
- 1 Dr. Andrew M. Rose  
American Institutes for Research  
1055 Thomas Jefferson St. NW  
Washington, DC 20007
- 1 Dr. Leonard L. Rosenbaum, Chairman  
Department of Psychology  
Montgomery College  
Rockville, MD 20850
- 1 Dr. Ernst Z. Rothkopf  
Bell Laboratories  
600 Mountain Avenue  
Murray Hill, NJ 07974
- 1 Dr. Donald Rubin  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08450
- 1 Dr. Larry Rudner  
Gallaudet College  
Kendall Green  
Washington, DC 20002
- 1 Dr. J. Ryan  
Department of Education  
University of South Carolina  
Columbia, SC 29208
- 1 PROF. FUMIKO SAMEJIMA  
DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE  
KNOXVILLE, TN 37916
- 1 Dr. Kazao Shigenasu  
University of Tohoku  
Department of Educational Psychology  
Kawauchi, Sendai 982  
JAPAN
- 1 Dr. Richard Snow  
School of Education  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305
- 1 Dr. Robert Sternberg  
Dept. of Psychology  
Yale University  
Box 11A, Yale Station  
New Haven, CT 06520
- 1 DR. PATRICK SUPPES  
INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL STUDIES IN  
THE SOCIAL SCIENCES  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
STANFORD, CA 94305
- 1 Dr. Hariharan Swaminathan  
Laboratory of Psychometric and  
Evaluation Research  
School of Education  
University of Massachusetts  
Amherst, MA 01003
- 1 Dr. Brad Simpson  
Office of Data Analysis Research  
Educational Testing Service  
Princeton, NJ 08541
- 1 Dr. Kikumi Tatsuoka  
Computer Based Education Research  
Laboratory  
252 Engineering Research Laboratory  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, IL 61801

## Non Govt

- 1 Dr. Maurice Tatsuoka  
Department of Educational Psychology  
University of Illinois  
Champaign, IL 61801
- 1 Dr. David Thissen  
Department of Psychology  
University of Kansas  
Lawrence, KS 66044
- 1 Dr. Robert Tsutakawa  
Dept. of Statistics  
University of Missouri  
Columbia, MO 65201
- 1 Dr. J. Uhlander  
Perceptronics, Inc.  
6271 Variel Avenue  
Woodland Hills, CA 91364
- 1 Dr. Howard Wainer  
Bureau of Social Science Research  
1990 M Street, N. W.  
Washington, DC 20036
- 1 DR. THOMAS WALLSTEN  
PSYCHOMETRIC LABORATORY  
DAVIE HALL 013A  
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROL  
CHAPEL HILL, NC 27514
- 1 Dr. David J. Weiss  
N660 Elliott Hall  
University of Minnesota  
75 E. River Road  
Minneapolis, MN 55455
- 1 DR. SUSAN E. WHITELY  
PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT  
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS  
LAWRENCE, KANSAS 66044
- 1 Dr. Wolfgang Wildgrube  
Streitkraefteamt  
Rosenberg 5300  
Bonn, West Germany D-5300

## Non Govt

- 1 Dr. J. Arthur Woodward  
Department of Psychology  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90024
- 1 Dr. Robert Woud  
School Examination Department  
University of London  
66-72 Gower Street  
London WC1E 6EE  
ENGLAND
- 1 Dr. Karl Zinn  
Center for research on Learning  
and Teaching  
University of Michigan  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104